



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|

08/900,964 07/28/97 CAPPALO

R P2106/757

EXAMINER

LM02/0510

CARR INFILIPPO & PERRELL  
2225 EAST BAYSHORE ROAD  
SUITE 200  
PALO ALTO CA 94303

NGUYEN, J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2778

DATE MAILED:

05/10/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
**08/900,964**

Applicant(s)

**Richard D. Capps**

Examiner

**Jimmy H. Nguyen**

Group Art Unit

**2778**



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Mar 3, 2000

☒ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1035 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

## Disposition of Claim

☒ Claim(s) 26-45 is/are pending in the application

Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 26-45 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

## Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some\* ☒ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been  
☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

— SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES —

Art Unit: 2778

## **Detailed Action**

### ***Drawings***

1. Figures 1 and 4A should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 26, 27, 34-37 and 41-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McLaughlin et al. (USPN: 5,570,108) in view Whitehead (USPN: 4,733,229).

In regard to claims 26, 27, 34, 36, 37, 41 and 43-45, McLaughlin et al. discloses a method and system for generating a high-luminance viewing window on a computer display device

Art Unit: 2778

comprising a host computer system for running an application program, a processor device for automatically generating a window control signal in response to said application program, and a computer display device 16 (figure 1, abstract, column 4, lines 55-66), wherein said computer display device comprises a window generator device 16C for receiving said window control signal and for generating a window information signal, and a display control device 16D to control the characteristics (including the size, position, brightness and contrast) of the main window and said high-luminance viewing window, which have two distinct informations, one within and other outside said high-luminance viewing window, and both are displayed on a CRT display screen in response to window information signal from manual controls 16B or from said window generator device processor (figures 1, 5, 8 and 11, abstract, column 5, lines 10-28 and lines 52-66, column 14, lines 36-42 and column 15, lines 13-22).

McLaughlin et al. does not disclose expressly how to process a video signal in response to said window information signal to generate high-luminance viewing window thereon.

Whitehead discloses a system for generating selected highlight area on a CRT display screen comprising a window generator device 38 (comprising 56, 58 and 60), for receiving a window control signal generated by the microprocessor (54) in response to the information sending from a highlight operator controls 15 (including 16 and 18) and for generating a window information signal (output of an AND gate 60), and a display control device (including 32, 68 and 70), including a video amplifier 68, for receiving an input video signal, processing said received video signal responsive to said window information signal to generate said high-

Art Unit: 2778

luminance window and providing a processed video signal to a CRT computer display screen (figures 2 and 4, column 6, lines 18-63, column 4, lines 22-37). Whitehead also teaches two distinct informations, one stored in 25 and displayed within said high-luminance viewing window and other stored in 23 and displayed outside of said high-luminance viewing window (figure 4, column 6, lines 35-52).

McLaughlin et al. and Whitehead are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, that is the computer art.

At the time this invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art to utilize teachings of Whitehead to explain clearly the functions of said window generator device and said control display device of McLaughlin et al., or to combine Whitehead's said window generator device and said control display device with the system of McLaughlin et al..

The suggestion for doing so would have been to allow the operator adjusting the brightness and/or contrast of the selected highlight area and/or the background image independently, either by manual controls on the display or an application program run by a separate host computer.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Whitehead with McLaughlin et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claims above.

In regard to claims 35 and 42 as applied respectively to claims 26 and 36 above, McLaughlin et al. in view of Whitehead does not disclose expressly that where the horizontal and

Art Unit: 2778

vertical synchronization signals are come from (Whitehead, figure 4). However, the computer providing the horizontal and vertical synchronization signals to a computer display device via a cable is well-known to a person of ordinary skill in the art. Therefore, these claims are rejected for the reason as set forth above.

4. Claims 28-33 and 38-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McLaughlin et al. in view Whitehead and further in view of Lagoni (USPN: 5,204,748).

In regard to claims 28-33 and 38-40 as applied to claims 26 and 36 above, McLaughlin et al. in view of Whitehead discloses that wherein said display control device is a video amplifier 68 (Whitehead, figure 4) and said window control signal provides information relate to size and position of viewing window (McLaughlin et al., figure 11, column 14, lines 36-42 and column 3, lines 47-56. Whitehead, figure 4, column 6, lines 18-34). McLaughlin et al. in view of Whitehead further discloses that the computer display device receives window control signals from the host computer and adjusts the electron guns within display screen in response to said window control signals by passing said window information, which is derived from said window control signal, to said display control circuit (McLaughlin et al., column 5, lines 10-28). McLaughlin et al. in view of Whitehead further discloses said window information signal is passed to a Gain Select circuit 70 of said display control device (Whitehead, figure 4).

Art Unit: 2778

However, McLaughlin et al. in view of Whitehead does not disclose expressly said Gain Select circuit or said display control device in detail such as an involvement of an automatic beam limiter and a high voltage power supply for generating a high-luminance viewing window on a display screen.

Lagoni teaches a method and an apparatus for displaying a sub-window on a main window on a display device (column 1, lines 7-11), wherein the sub-window is not isolated from the influence of the main picture but rather has a specific relationship in that the sub-window may have a different luminance (figure 2, summary), and said display device comprises a high voltage power supply 29 for providing a high voltage signal to an anode of said CRT device (this feature in fact is well-known to a person of ordinary skill in the art), and an automatic beam limiter (BCL section) for sampling the current of said high voltage signal to automatically determine when to limit said signal (the function of ABL is well-known to a person of ordinary skill in the art) (figures 1-2, column 1, lines 26-49, and column 7, line 56 - column 8, line 36). Lagoni further teaches that a window generator device 5 receives a window control signal providing the size and position of said sub-window and generates a window information signal FS to said ABL, and said ABL provides an analog window signal to control the gain of a video amplifier (a combination of 9-11, 13, 15, 17 and 39) (figures 1-2, column 6, lines 48 - column 7, line 55).

Lagoni, McLaughlin et al. and Whitehead are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, that is the computer art.

Art Unit: 2778

At the time this invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art to utilize teachings of Lagoni to explain clearly the Gain Select circuit 70 of Whitehead and said control display device of McLaughlin et al., or to combine Lagoni's ABL with the system of McLaughlin et al. in view of Whitehead.

The suggestion for doing so would have been to obtain a system for generating high-luminance viewing window, which is not isolated from the influence of the main picture but rather has a specific relationship in that the sub-window has a higher luminance.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Lagoni and Whitehead with McLaughlin et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claims above.

### ***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's argument filed "Importantly, .... a window", on page 7, lines 19-23, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive, because McLaughlin et al.'s display control circuit 16D receives a video signal and a window information via a microprocessor 16C (figure 1), generates a high luminance window 300 having a test image and controls the luminance of the test window 300 as shown in figure 11 and as described at column 15, lines 13-22.

Applicant's argument filed "Thus, ... portion", on page 8, lines 8-10, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive, because Whitehead implicitly teaches a high luminance window generated in response to a window control signal (see the rejection above). In fact, it



Art Unit: 2778

would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that Whitehead's device implicitly functions as an all-in-one special type computer system such as a portable computer, since Whitehead's device includes a joystick 16 functioning as a pointing device, a keyboard 12, a display (34, 70, 68, 32) and a microprocessor 54 functioning as a CPU and obviously comprising an application software program to calculate and to provide a windowed information in response to the information sending from the highlight operator controls (15) including a joystick (16) and controls (18) (figure 4, column 6, line 22-37).

Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

### ***Conclusion***

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2778

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jimmy H. Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 306-5422. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Thursday from 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bipin Shalwala, can be reached on (703) 305-4938.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3800.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 308-9051 (for formal communications intended for entry)

(703) 308-6606 (for informal or draft communications, please label

“Proposed” or “Draft”)

Hand delivered response should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth floor (Receptionist).

Application/Control Number: 08/900,964

Page 10

Art Unit: 2778

JHN

05/03/2000

  
Amare Mengistu  
Primary Examiner